REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 131-286 remain in this application. Claims 19-64 have been canceled.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 19-28 and 30-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Re. 36, 801) in view of Ito et al ('894 B2).

Applicant has canceled Claims 19-64. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is considered moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 41-50, 52-62 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Re. 36, 801) in view of Ito et al ('894 B2) and further in view of Hirayama et al ('356).

Applicant has canceled Claims 19-64. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is considered moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 51 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Re. 36,801) in view of Ito et al ('894 B2) and

further in view of Hirayama et al ('356), as applied to claims 41 and 53 above, and further in view of Yuen et al. ('409).

Applicant has canceled Claims 19-64. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is considered moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 131-136, 139-141, 143-149, 152-154, 156, 183-188, 191-193, 195-201, 204-206, 208, 235-240, 243-245, 247-253, 256-258 and 260 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 131 appears as follows:

> 131. A method for storage and display of multimedia data, comprising the steps of:
>
> receiving a digital television stream;
>
> extracting from the digital television stream an MPEG stream that contains a plurality of video frames and time stamps associated with the video frames;
>
> identifying starting locations of video frames within the MPEG stream and time stamps associated with video frames;
>
> storing on a storage device the MPEG stream, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG stream and time stamps associated with the video frames, the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams;
>
> accepting a user control command;
>
> in response to the user control command, selecting a particular video frame from within a particular MPEG stream stored on the storage device using a time stamp associated with the selected particular video frame;
>
> retrieving the selected particular video frame using a stored starting location of the selected particular video frame; and
>
> sending the selected particular video frame for display.

In particular, Kawamura does not teach or disclose a system that identifies starting locations of video frames within the MPEG stream and time stamps associated with video frames and storing on a storage device the MPEG stream, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG stream and time stamps associated with the video frames, the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams as cited in Claim 131.

The Office Action cites col. 11, lines 40-67 as disclosing the above elements. Col. 11, line 40-col. 12, line 3 state:

> "One feature of the present invention is the time code interpolating circuit 42 that interpolates time codes that are intermittently supplied thereto so as to generate successive time codes. The header separating circuit 22 separates a time code (TC) from a GOP header and supplies the separated time code to the time code interpolating circuit 42 which outputs the time code (TC) for a picture at the beginning of the GOP. For a picture not at the beginning of GOP, the time code interpolating circuit 42 outputs an incremented value (in the normal reproduction mode) or a decremented value (in the reverse reproduction mode) as an interpolated time code, thereby generating time codes for every picture in the GOP.
>
> FIG. 17 shows the relation between the pictures in a GOP and the time codes in accordance with the present invention. For the first picture I.sub.0 of a particular GOP, the time code (0h01m02s01f) that has been designated in the encoding process is obtained from the GOP header (where h represents hour, m represents minute, s represents second, and f represents frame). The next picture B.sub.0 was not assigned a time code by the encoding process. Thus, the time code interpolating circuit 42 generates the interpolated time code (0h01m02s02f) for the picture B.sub.0. In the same manner, the time code interpolating circuit 42 successively generates interpolated time codes for the remaining pictures belonging to the same GOP as picture I.sub.0. Consequently, the time code interpolating circuit 42 eventually generates the time code (0h01m02s16f) which, it is appreciated, happens to be assigned to the picture I.sub.1 ; and this same time code is read from the GOP header because I.sub.1 is the first picture of the next GOP."

However, Kawamura only discloses that the time code interpolating circuit 42 successively generates interpolated time codes for the remaining pictures belonging to the same GOP. Kawamura does not contemplate identifying starting locations of video frames within the MPEG stream and storing on a storage device the MPEG stream, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG stream and time stamps associated with the video frames. Kawamura makes no mention of such features.

Kawamura further does not contemplate the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams. Kawamura makes no mention of such a feature. Kawamura deals with decoding moving picture and audio data read from a pre-recorded disc that is read-only.

In a proper rejection under § 102(e) the cited reference must show each and every claimed feature in the same combination as arranged in the claim. See Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Barient, Inc., 827 F.2d 744, 747-48, 3 USPQ2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987). If even a single element or limitation is missing from the reference, anticipation is not found. Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Kawamura therefore does not teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly.

Claim 131 is allowable. Independent Claims 144, 183, 196, 235, and 248 are similarly allowable. Claims 132-136, 139-141, 143, and 145-149, 152-154, 156, and 184-188, 191-193, 195, and 197-201, 204-206, 208, and 236-240, 243-245, 247, and 249-253, 256-258, 260 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 183, 196, 235, and 248,

respectively, and are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

VI. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 157-162, 165-167, 169-175, 178-180, 182, 209-214, 217-219, 221-227, 230-232, 234, 261-266, 269-271, 273-279, 282-284, and 286 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 131, Claims 157, 170, 209, 222, 261, and 274 are similarly allowable in light of Kawamura and the Final Office Action's comments. Claims 158-162, 165-167, 169, and 171-175, 178-180, 182, and 210-214, 217-219, 221, and 223-227, 230-232, 234, and 262-266, 269-271, 273, and 275-279, 282-284, 286 are dependent upon Claims 157, 170, 209, 222, 261, and 274, respectively, and are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

VII. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 137, 142, 150, 155, 163, 168, 176, 181, 189, 194, 202, 207, 215, 220, 228, 233, 241, 246, 254, 259, 267, 272, 280, and 285 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982) in view of Logan et al. (Re. 36,801). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, above. Claims 137, 142, and 150, 155, and 163, 168, and 176, 181, and 189, 194,

and 202, 207, and 215, 220, and 228, 233, and 241, 246, and 254, 259, and 267, 272, and 280, 285 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, respectively, and are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

VIII. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 138, 151, 164, 177, 190, 203, 216, 229, 242, 255, 268, and 281 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982) in view of Yuen et al. (US 5,488,409). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, above. Claims 138, and 151, and 164, and 177, and 190, and 203, and 216, and 229, and 242, and 255, and 268, and 281 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, respectively, and are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

IX. MISCELLANEOUS

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Final Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the amendments herein and further examination on the merits are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1080 ext. 214 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: February 8, 2007

Kirk D. Wong
Reg. No. 43,284

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 214
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Trademarks, ~~2900 Crystal Drive~~, Arlington , VA ~~22202-3514~~ P.O. Box 1450 2233-1450

on February 8, 2007 by